

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

ROBERT E. HUNT,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	4:05CV3113
	)	
vs.	)	ORDER
	)	
FRANK HOPKINS, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

This matter is before the court on filing no. 41, the motion for appointment of counsel, filed by the plaintiff. The court cannot routinely appoint counsel in civil cases. In Davis v. Scott, 94 F.3d 444, 447 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1996), the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals explained: “‘Indigent civil litigants do not have a constitutional or statutory right to appointed counsel.’... The trial court has broad discretion to decide whether both the plaintiff and the court will benefit from the appointment of counsel, taking into account the factual and legal complexity of the case, the presence or absence of conflicting testimony, and the plaintiff's ability to investigate the facts and present his claim.” (Citations omitted.) The plaintiff has capably presented the factual basis for the claims in this proceeding. I find that appointment of counsel is not necessary to enable the plaintiff to pursue those claims. Therefore, filing no. 41 is denied insofar as it pertains to the motion for appointment of counsel.

SO ORDERED.

DATED this 17<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2006.

BY THE COURT:

S/F.A. GOSSETT  
United States Magistrate Judge